UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,070	02/06/2004	Wai Lam Ng	10284-8	5275

25716 7590 04/20/2005

BLUMENFELD, KAPLAN & SANDWEISS, P.C.
168 NORTH MERAMEC
4TH FLOOR
CLAYTON, MO 63105-3763

EXAMINER	
PICKETT, JOHN G	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3728	

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

e

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/708,070	NG, WAI LAM	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gregory Pickett	3728	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 February 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *06 February 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2/6/04*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The use of the trademark VELCRO has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 13 is objected to because of the following minor informalities: the second occurrence of "not fully closed" is repetitive. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8-11, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee (US 6,283,299; provided by applicant).

Regarding claims 1 and 5, Lee discloses a first compartment 12 to store a video screen 14, a second compartment 10 to store a video player 34, with the first and

second compartments connectable by means of hook and loop fasteners 21 and 23. Contrary to the applicant's assertion in the specification (paragraph [0003]), first compartment 12 and second compartment 10 are separable (see Col. 3, lines 41-42 and Figure 7).

As to claim 6, video player 34 is a video cassette player.

As to claim 8, video player 34 is secured in second compartment 10 by means of hook and loop fasteners 27 & 29 (see Figure 3).

As to claim 9, Lee discloses connection wires and an opening in second compartment 10 for routing the wires (see Figure 4).

As to claims 10 and 11, Lee discloses power adapter 50 for connection to a power outlet of an automobile.

As to claim 13, Lee discloses operation in a partially connected state (see Figures 1 and 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US 6,283,299).

Lee discloses the claimed invention except for the DVD player. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a DVD player in the system of Lee since the examiner takes Official Notice of the equivalence of a DVD player and a video cassette player for their use in their deliverance of a video image to a video screen and the selection of any of these known equivalents to play recorded videos would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

5. Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sauer et al (US 5,938,096) in view of Richardson et al (US 6,028,764; provided by applicant) and Gray (US 2,536,169).

Regarding claim 1, Sauer et al discloses a first compartment 30 to store a video screen and a second compartment 20 to store a video player. Sauer et al uses a zipper fastener to join the two compartments. Sauer meets all limitations claimed by the applicant except for separable compartments.

Richardson discloses that it was known in the art to have a computer system 12 with a separable screen 14 to locate the screen in a more convenient location (see Abstract).

Gray discloses a case with separable portions 10 and 11 joined by a zipper fastener 13 (see Col. 2, lines 31-34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the apparatus of Sauer et al with a separable zipper fastener as taught by Gray in order to locate the screen of a computer system at a different location from the remainder of the computer as suggested by Richardson et al.

As to claim 2, Sauer et al discloses a video screen secured by a zipper 62.

Regarding claims 5 and 7, Sauer-Richardson-Gray, as applied to claim 1, discloses the claimed invention except for the express disclosure of a video player. The examiner takes Official Notice that the provision of a CD/DVD drive within a laptop computer system was common and conventional at the time the invention was made and the provision of such a drive in the computer system of Richardson et al would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in order for a salesman to present sales video images to potential customers (see for example, Richardson et al; Col. 1, lines 23-31). As such, the base computer (Richardson 12) is deemed a video player and the system of Sauer-Richardson-Gray discloses the claimed invention.

As to claim 8, video player (Richardson 12) would have been secured into second compartment (Sauer et al 20) by means of a zipper (Sauer et al 72).

6. Claims 3, 4, and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sauer-Richardson-Gray as applied to claims 1 and 5 above, and further in view of Meritt (US 6,216,927 B1; provided by applicant).

Sauer-Richardson-Gray discloses the claimed invention except for the means for mounting the video screen.

Meritt discloses a means 25 (see Figure 3) with snap 26 for mounting the video screen to the headrest of a vehicle. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the system of Sauer-Richardson-Gray with a mounting means as taught by Meritt in order to present video to passengers in an automobile.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory Pickett whose telephone number is 571-272-4560. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 11:30 AM - 8:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mickey Yu can be reached on 571-272-4562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Greg Pickett
Examiner
13 April 2005

Mickey Yu
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700